



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 20, 2017

Ms. Yvette Aguilar  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Corpus Christi  
P. O. Box 9277  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2017-01398

Dear Ms. Aguilar:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 642156 (CCPD File No. LGar3).

The Corpus Christi Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the information we marked and indicated consists of reports of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect made to the department. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. The department states it has not adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Thus, we conclude the information we marked and indicated is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).* However, we find the department has not established the remaining information consists of a report of child abuse or neglect nor does the information reveal the identity of an individual who made a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect for purposes of section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. Furthermore, we find the department failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. Therefore, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).* Additionally, under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy

interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>1</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. We note the requestor has a right of access to her private information that is otherwise protected under common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at (4) (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

We note the information at issue includes the date of birth of the requestor's spouse. Accordingly, the requestor may have a right of access to her spouse's date of birth if she is acting as her spouse's authorized representative. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, if the requestor is acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the department may not withhold his date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the requestor is not acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the department must withhold his date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. In any event, the department must withhold the information we marked and indicated that does not pertain to the requestor or her spouse under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. If the requestor is acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the department may not withhold his date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the requestor is not acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the department must withhold his date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we marked and

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.102(a) exempts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

indicated that does not pertain to the requestor or her spouse under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.<sup>3</sup>

The department asks this office to issue a previous determination that would permit the department to withhold from disclosure information made confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under section 552.301 of the Government Code. We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, this letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 642156

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a ruling from this office.